



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,009	11/14/2003	Francoise Arnaud	244215US41CONT	7874
22850	7590	11/03/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			BAHTA, KIDEST	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2125	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/712,009	ARNAUD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kidest Bahta	2125	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-21, 23-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Strevey et al. (U.S. Patent 6,035,305).

Regarding claims 1 and 18, Strevey discloses that means for describing a set of technical objects (Abstract; i.e., ...product information object), each technical object **either** representing a product function (Abstract; i.e., a product information object ...functional tests) **or** describing an implementation method for the product function, the set of technical objects representing manufacturing options of the industrial product (column 2, lines 35-40; i.e., the product information to produce a computer program that validates product selection options and configures a product is provided); means for storing and updating a definition of each technical object (abstract; i.e., Information pertaining to selected objects and their configuration is stored in a database. Changes can be made directly to the information stored in the database) and of its inter-relations with other of the technical objects in the product configuration (column 7, lines 34-42, column 9, lines 14-30) said definition comprising an expression of rules and constraints (Abstract); and means for data input (column 7, lines 1-3) and

means for interactively and dynamically using said means for storing and updating during said configuration of the product (column 3, lines 30-40; column 18, lines 35-43, column 19, lines 1-24; Fig. 11; i.e., A user creates a graphical representation of the product configuration options, and enters information pertaining to each of the graphical objects. The invention allows a user to create a Knowledge Map containing the product configuration quickly, efficiently, and accurately. Furthermore, modifications to the Knowledge Map representation are also made efficiently and accurately. The Knowledge Map provides a customer with a well organized description of the available options when determining a desired configuration of a complex product, such as a commercial aircraft).

Regarding claim 2, Strevey discloses that each technical object represents either a function of an aircraft **or** describes an implementation method of the aircraft function to create an aircraft configuration (column 3, lines 30-40).

Regarding claims 3, 4, and 10-15, 17, Strevey discloses wherein the knowledge management module is configured to manage technical objects each representing an aircraft function (abstract), wherein the contract management module is configured to manage fleet configurations of aircraft (Abstract; column 14, lines 35-40, Fig. 2. i.e., a computer base method of collecting, structuring and displaying product configuration information); wherein the administration module is configured to manage user profiles (Fig. 5A, Fig. 8 to Fig. 11), and wherein the mass management module is configured to manage mass of a customized configuration from data supplied from the contract management module (column 9, lines 1-14).

Regarding claim 5, Strevey discloses the industrial product is considered as a set of functions in a functional approach (Abstract).

Regarding claim 8, Strevey discloses in the means for processing a functional oriented configuration is used that supplies a functional approach to directly select technical objects, specifying required properties of a functional characteristic (column 1, lines 41-61).

Regarding claim 9, Strevey discloses allows a contract manager to start a configuration checking process at any time (column 3, lines 12-40, i.e., .... the system automatically maintains and verifies predefined constraints regarding the creation of a Knowledge Map. This includes verifying that a hard called-out option identifier associated with a graphical product object on a Knowledge Map is not used twice).

Regarding claims 19-21, and 25, Strevey discloses industrial product (fleet) is an aircraft and helicopters (it is inherent that the computer base system and method can implemented for a plurality of complex product such as aircraft, see abstract and, column 3, lines 22-40. Note: the aircraft is a machine or a device, such as airplane, helicopter or vehicle.), the fleet is an automobiles (it is inherit that the computer program implemented for aircraft can also applied to the automobile).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Strevey discloses means for updating said fleet by adding or removing a vehicle and aircraft (column 7, lines 51-60); and means for managing a plurality of fleets and updating the plurality of fleets when a vehicle is transferred from one fleet to another fleet (column 7, lines 51-60).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strevey (US 6,035,305) in view of Sandifer (US 2003/0187878).

Regarding claims 7 and 22, Strevey discloses the limitation of claims 1, 18 and 19 but fails to disclose the limitation of claims 7 and 22. However, Sandifer discloses the limitation of claims 7 and 22 as follow: technical object oriented configuration is used in which the options and corresponding implementation methods are selected directly in a list sorted by ATA chapter the selection being made either individually globally using a global procedure that joins a possible application and a weight to a set of options in a same functional domain ([0019]; [0828]; [0838]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teachings of strevey with the teachings of Sandifer in order to provide access to complex technical information employed to maintain and repair complicated equipment, such as aircraft, to enable compliance with regulatory requirements.

Regarding 26-31, Strevey discloses the list is further sorted by sales policy and job category (column 14, lines 35-40; column 20, lines 34-40).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strevey (US 6,035,305) in view of Hasiewicz et al. (US 2004/0243636).

Regarding claim 6, Strevey discloses the limitation of claims 1 and 3 but fails to disclose the limitation of claims 6. However, Hasiewicz discloses the limitation of claim 6 as follows: the contract management module works in disconnected mode ([0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make to modify the teachings of Strevey with the teachings of Hasiewicz in order to execute alert generation and incident identification rules against the raw data.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9/6/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant amended and argues that Strevey fails to disclose a mass management module. However, Examiner disagrees since Strevey discloses (column 1, lines 55-61, i.e., number of passenger seat...; Fig. 7D, and Fig. 19, i.e., MAXIMUM LANDING WEIGHT, which shows Strevey discloses the way to control mass or weight ... of passenger).

Regarding claim 18, Applicant argues that Strevey fails to disclose a plurality of sets of technical objects, sets...representing manufacturing options for a vehicle in the fleet. Examiner disagrees since Strevey discloses grouping

*product options (abstract, i.e., since sets are representing manufacturing options ... fleet, Strevey's grouping product or modules shows it is more than one product with more than one options it is not only one product or one options.)*

*Regarding claims 6-7, 22, sine Applicant amend the claims the new rejection been has made, see Par. 4 and 5.*

### **Conclusion**

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed Kidest Bahta whose telephone number is 571-272-3737.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 571-272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAG system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kidest Bahta



October 31, 2005